

# Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/675,113

Applicant(s)

HALE ET AL.

Examiner

Ronald Baum

Art Unit

2136

## All Participants:

(1) Ronald Baum.

(2) William Schaal.

Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 7 September 2004

Time: 13:20

## Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

7/2/04

Claims discussed:

all

Prior art documents discussed:

n/a

## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

## Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Upon examiner reconsideration of applicants prior arguments in the remarks of 7/2/2004, discussed how claim 1 requires elements from dependent claims 2,4,5, (and associated similar claims, see examiner amendment). The examiner proposed appropriate changes via examiner amendment, into the claims that would sufficiently narrow the scope and distinguish the invention for allowance. Mr. Schaal got the approval of the applicant, and forwarded all discussed changes in supplemental amendment dated 9/7/2004. . .